63

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

Single Bench : **Hon'ble Shri H.L. Dattu, CJ.**

Contempt Petition No. 146 of 2005

Petitioners

1. Ram Kumar Yadav, S/o Shri Sant Ram Yadav, Aged about – 42 years, R/o – Village – Tilda Bandha, P.O. – Newra Via Suhela, Tehsil – Simga, District – Raipur, (C.G.)
2. Ramdheen Sahu, S/o Shri Deendyal Sahu, Aged about – 42 years, R/o Post – Jara, P.S.- Palari, District – Raipur, (C.G.)
3. Siyaram, S/o Shri Deendyal Dhruv, Aged about – 43 years, R/o – Village – Kharamira, District – Raipur, (C.G.)
4. Smt. Devkunwar Verma, W/o Shri Bisheshwar Verma, Aged about – 42 years, R/o – Gram Tunduwa, Tahsil – Tilda, District – Raipur, (C.G.)
5. Ramlakhan Sinha, s/o Shri M.R. Sinha, Aged about 35 years, R/o Village – Gatapara, P.S. – Palari, District – Raipur, (C.G.)

Vs.

Contemnor

Respondent

Formal Party

1. Shri Awadh Bihari Dubey, aged about 60 years, Director Lok Shikshan Sanchanalaya, Mantralay D.K.S. Bhavan, Raipur, (C.G.)
2. State of Chhattisgarh, Through : Secretary, Department of Education, Mantralaya, D.K.S. Bhavan, Raipur, (C.G.)

Petition under Section 2 (c) and 12 of Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 read with Article 215 of the Constitution of India.

Present: Shri B.R. Ghosh, counsel for the petitioners.
Shri C.Jayant K. Rao, counsel for the respondents.

ORAL ORDER
(Passed on 26th April, 2007)

The only direction issued by this Court in Writ Petition No. 1265 of 2005 was to direct respondent No.2 to consider the representation filed by the petitioners and pass appropriate orders in accordance with law.

64

(2) Alleging that the respondent No.2 has not considered their representation and thereby disobeyed the orders and directions issued by this Court, the petitioners are before this Court in this contempt petition.

(3) The respondents have entered their appearance through learned counsel.

(4) At the time of hearing of the contempt petition, learned counsel for respondent No.2 would submit that they have considered the representation filed by the petitioners and have passed appropriate orders.

(5) Since the direction issued by this Court was to consider the representation and that representation was considered by respondent No.2, in my opinion, there is no deliberate disobedience of the orders and directions issued by this court. Therefore, I do not intend to take cognizance of this contempt petition. Accordingly, the contempt petition is disposed of. However, liberty is reserved to the petitioners to question the correctness or otherwise of the order passed by respondent No.2, if they so desire. Ordered accordingly.

Sd/-
Chief Justice